2271. ^*Transferred to the* 20th, *December,* 1985.]

Reduction in import duty on Pig iron

2272. SHRI CHIMANBHAI: ME HTA: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government of Gujarat has request ed for reduction in import duty on pig iron which is 70 per cent of the CIF cost and hence the cost of im ported iron comes to Rs. 4000 *%. e.* higher by Rs. 1000 per M. Ton as compared to local price;

(b) whether in view of the local short supply, the Gujarat state Small Scale Industries Corporation was allowed to import 25 thousand M. Ton pig iron and that imported iron contained 4 per cent phosphorus and therefore not eligible for 30 per cent customs duty reduction effected on 1st August, 1985; and

(•c) whetherf Government propose to make fresh reduction in import duty as requested by the Gujarat Government?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARY): (a) A request has been received from the Government of Gujarat for reduction in import duty on pig iron. According to *trie* latest calculation furnished by M/s. Gujarat Small Scale Industries Corporation Ltd., the cost of imported pig iron is Rs. 3750 per tonne a_s against about Rs. 3000 per tonne for indigenous pig iron.

(b) M|s. Gujarat Small Scale Industries Corporation Ltd. have been allowed to import 23000 tonnes of pig iron through M/s. M. M. T. C. the canalising agency. Till the 8th December, 1985; only pig iron having phosphorus content not exceeding 0.1 per cent was eligible for the concesional duty of 40 per cent adva-lorem plu_s Rs. 80 per tonne.

(c) With effect from 9th December, the import duty on pig iron of all grades has been fixed at 55 per cent advalorem plus Rs. 80 per tonne. A copy of the notification issue in this respect has already been laid on the Table of the House.

M/s. Parle Exports Pvt. Lld./Bisleri India Pvt. Ltd.

2273, SHRI KALPNATH RAI: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state;

(a) whether Government are aware that M/s. Parle Exports Private Limited are regularly violating the provis. ions of the FERA;

(b) if so, what penal action ha9 been taken by Government against these firms;

(c) whether Government are aware that some Central Government officers in connivance with the aobve firms are delaying the cases against these firms; and

(d) if so what action Government are contemplating to prosecute the Directors of the firms to prevent recurrence of such type of offence?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARY): (a) and (b) On the basis of documents seized as a result of searches conducted in I November, 1977 and further investigations made a case against M/s. Bisleri India Pvt. Ltd., Bombay and its two Directors, namely, S/Shri Ramesh J. Chauhan and H.M. Golwala was adjudicated by the Enforcement Directorate (FERA) on 25-9-1978, imposing penalties of Rs. 1,50,000 on the company and Rs. 15,000 each on the two directors.

On a complaint from Enforcement Directorate the C.B.I, registered a case against M/s. Bisleri India Pvt. Ltd. and it<i two directors, for offences under IPC and FERA, on 5-4-1980 and subsequently searched the premises of M7s. Bisleri India Pvt. Ltd. and some other

connected premises. On the basis of investigation by CBI, a complaint was filed in the court of ACMM, Bombay on 16-4-81. On a writ filed before it, the Bombay High Court quashed the proceedings in the trial court by its order dt. 14-1-82 Against the order of the Bombay High Court, an SEP has been filed before the Supreme Court on 14-4-82 and is *sub-judice* before the Supreme Court.

The Enforcement Directorate searched the premises of M/s. Parle Export Pvt. Ltd., Bombay in May, 1981. On the basis of further investigations, 5 Show Cause Notices have been issued to the company and its two directors, namely S/Shri Ramesh J. Chauhan and H.M. Golwala on 19-3-82. These Show Cause Notices are pending adjudication. The case has already been heard on several days by the adjudicating officer but due to examination and cross examination of several witnesses, the hearing has not been completed. Simultaneously prosecution has also been launched against the company and its two directors, on 19-3-1984, in the Court of ACMM, Bombay.

(c) No such instance of connivance has come to the notice of the Govern ment.

(d) Prosecutions against the " Two companies and its two directors have already been launched as stated in [(a) & (b) above.

Misuse of Import Licence by M/s. Parle Export Pvt. Ltd.

2274. SHRI KALPNATH RAI: Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleasod to state:

(a) whether M/s. Parle Bottling Company (now know as Parle Exports Private Limited) has misutilised the Actual User Licence for the import of bottle filling machines;

(b) whether Mr. Ramesh Chauhan, Director of the Parle Exports Private limited, was arrested in contravention of Import Trade Control Regulation Act and FERA as reported in the I "Times of India' of the 28th July, 1981;

(c) whether Government have taken deartmental action for black listing the firms; and

(d) if not what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OP THE MINISTRY OF TEXTILES (SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN): (a) There is an allegation of misuse of imported bottle filling machines.

(b) Shri Ramesh Chauhan was arrested under Foreign Exchange Regulation Act.

(c) and *(d)* Action has b%en initiated for debarment under^ Clause 8 of Imports (Control) Order, 1955, Prosecution has also been launched under Section 5 of the Import and Export Control Act which is pending trial in the Court of Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Bombay.

CBI Inquiry against the conduct .of some officers of Rourkela Steel plant

22T5. DR. SHYAM SUNDAR MOHAPATRA: Will the Minister of STEEL AND MINES be pleased to state:

(a) whether SAIL has decided to revert the Orissa Cadre LAs Officers from Rourkela Steel Plant if so, what are the reasons therefor; and

(b) whether any CBI inquiry has been conducted into the conduct of some officers of Rourkela Steel Plant; if so, what are the findings of the inquiry?

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI (K. C. PANT); (a) One IAS Officers of Orissa Cadre who was on deputation to Rourkela Steel Plant reverted back to Orissa Govern- ment on completion of his deputation period. This reversion to the parent cadre was in the normal course and based on existing Government policy and instructions and not on account of any decision taken by the Steel Authority of India Limited.

(b) Yes, Sir. In the recent past, i CBI enquiries were held into the con-